REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 4, 2009 ("*Office Action*"). At the time of the *Office Action*, Claims 1-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 were pending and rejected. Applicants amend Claims 1, 5, 9, and 14-17. Claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 31 were previously canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,976,210 issued to Silva et al. ("*Silva*"). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 30.

Independent Claim 1 of the present Application, as amended, recites:

> A method for defining a composite web page, comprising:
> identifying a web page;
> analyzing the web page to determine a list of HTML tags, each HTML tag corresponding to a particular portion of the content of the identified web page;
> presenting the determined list of HTML tags to a user in a navigation pane, the navigation pane presenting the determined list of HTML tags in the form of a tree structure that provides a visual representation of relationships between the HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of the identified web page, the navigation pane operable to allow the user to view and select one or more of the HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of the identified web page from the determined list of HTML tags;
> receiving a user selection of at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags in the form of the tree structure;
> in response to receiving the user selection of the at least one HTML tag, presenting, in a preview pane, the particular portion of the content of the identified web page corresponding to the at least one selected HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags, the preview pane operable to allow the user to visually verify the user selection;
> registering the user selection of the at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags; and
> rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page, the placement of the identified portion of content on the composite web page determined automatically when the composite webpage is requested based on the dimensions of a window to contain the composite web page.

Whether considered alone or in combination with any other cited references, *Silva* does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claims.[1]

For example, *Silva* does not disclose, teach, or suggest "rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page, the placement of the identified portion of content on the composite web page determined automatically when the composite webpage is requested based on the dimensions of a window to contain the composite web page," as recited in amended Claim 1. *Silva* merely discloses that the user "defines a layout of such information content within the clipping, if necessary, and the layout of the clipping itself within the totality of the composite Web view." (*Silva*, Column 1, lines 57-64). There is no disclosure in *Silva* of "rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page, the placement of the identified portion of content on the composite web page determined automatically when the composite webpage is requested based on the dimensions of a window to contain the composite web page," as recited in amended Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1, together with Claims 2-4, 6-8, 18, and 22 that depend on Claim 1. For analogous reasons, Applicants also request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 9, 14, 15, 16, and 17, together with Claims 10-13, 20, 24 that depend on Claim 9 and Claims 26, 28, 30, and 32 that depend on Claims 14, 15, 16, and 17, respectively.

Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations recited in Claim 1 prior to any amendment in this Response to Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that *Silva* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the each and every element recited in Applicant's now independent Claim 5.

For example, *Silva* does not disclose, teach, or suggest "wherein the list includes HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of each of the plurality of web

---

[1] "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. In addition, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claims" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); MPEP § 2131 (*emphasis added*).

pages," as recited in Claim 5. In the *Office Action*, the Examiner specifically relies upon Column 7, lines 28-47 of *Silva* for disclosure of Applicants' recited claim language. However, that portion of *Silva* discloses:

> One such methodology is through a GUI that enables the user to select the specific information on the source Web page to be included within his personal Web view by pointing and clicking on the information. This can be done, for example, by parsing the displayed page through a parser 210 to generate the document object model (DOM) of the source Web page, which is displayed in a separate window. As the user selects an element in the DOM tree the corresponding piece of the Web page can be highlighted in the browser to enable the user to identify his selections. Since DOM elements are uniquely identifiable in a Web page, the selected expression can simply use the DOM address to define which piece should be extracted by extractor 211.

(*Silva*, Column 7, lines 28-47). Thus, *Silva* indicates that each web page is parsed individually and displayed individually for selection by the user. *Silva* does not disclose, teach, or suggest "wherein the list includes HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of each of the plurality of web pages," as recited in Claim 5.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 5.

No Waiver

All of Applicants' arguments and amendments are without prejudice and disclaimer. Additionally, Applicants have merely discussed example reasons for allowability sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections. Applicants reserve the right to discuss additional reasons for allowance, such as additional distinctions over the references cited, the improper combination of the cited references, or the improper use of one or more references as prior art, in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Jenni R. Moen, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 415-4820.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge $220.00 for an additional independent claim to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. Applicants believe no other fees are due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credits to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Jenni R . Moen
Reg. No. 52,038

Date: November 11, 2009

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

at Customer No.   **05073**